

**Fox Hostler's, Inc. and Brotherhood Railway
Carmen of the United States and Canada, AFL-
CIO, CLC. Case 5-CA-13962**

May 25, 1982

DECISION AND ORDER

BY MEMBERS FANNING, JENKINS, AND
ZIMMERMAN

Upon a charge filed on December 24, 1981, and a first amended charge, filed on January 8, 1982, by Brotherhood Railway Carmen of the United States and Canada, AFL-CIO, CLC, herein called the Union, and duly served on Fox Hostler's, Inc.,¹ herein called Respondent, the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, by the Regional Director for Region 5, issued a complaint on February 10, 1982, against Respondent, alleging that Respondent had engaged in and was engaging in unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) and Section 2(6) and (7) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. Copies of the charge and complaint and notice of hearing before an administrative law judge were duly served on the parties to this proceeding.

With respect to the unfair labor practices, the complaint alleges in substance that on October 22, 1981, following a Board election in Case 5-RC-11493,² the Union was duly certified as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of Respondent's employees in the unit found appropriate; and that, commencing on or about December 18, 1981, and at all times thereafter, Respondent has refused, and continues to date to refuse, to bargain collectively with the Union as the exclusive bargaining representative, although the Union has requested and is requesting it to do so. On February 26, 1982, Respondent filed its answer to the complaint admitting in part, and denying in part, the allegations in the complaint.

On March 22, 1982, counsel for the General Counsel filed directly with the Board a Motion for Summary Judgment. Subsequently, on March 30,

1982, the Board issued an order transferring the proceeding to the Board and a Notice To Show Cause why the General Counsel's Motion for Summary Judgment should not be granted. Respondent thereafter filed a response to the Notice To Show Cause.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 3(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, the National Labor Relations Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to a three-member panel.

Upon the entire record in this proceeding, the Board makes the following:

Ruling on the Motion for Summary Judgment

In its answer to the complaint, Respondent denies that the Board certification of the Union as the exclusive representative of the aforesaid employees was valid. Respondent also contends that it was never legally required to bargain with the Union. The General Counsel argues that there are no factual issues present which would require a hearing, since the issues underlying Respondent's position were previously litigated and decided in the companion representation proceeding. In its response to the Notice To Show Cause, Respondent contends that it is not attempting to relitigate matters since it was never granted a hearing to litigate alleged activities of the Union which form the basis for its election objections. Thus, Respondent claims that the denial of a hearing violated its due process rights.

Review of the record herein reveals that, in Case 5-RC-11493, the petition was filed by the Union on April 6, 1981. The parties entered into a Stipulation for Certification Upon Consent Election agreement. The election was held on May 20, 1981. At the conclusion of the balloting, the tally revealed that 10 ballots had been cast for and 7 votes had been cast against the Union, with 1 void ballot and no challenged ballots. Respondent filed objections to the conduct of the election. On July 6, 1981, the Acting Regional Director issued and served on the parties a Report on Objections in which he recommended that the objections be overruled and that a Certification of Representative be issued. Respondent, on July 17, 1981, filed exceptions to the Regional Director's Report on Objections. On October 22, 1981, the Board adopted the conclusions and recommendations of the Acting Regional Director and issued a Decision and Certification of Representative.

It is well settled that in the absence of newly discovered or previously unavailable evidence or special circumstances a respondent in a proceeding alleging a violation of Section 8(a)(5) is not entitled

¹ On January 14, 1982, the Union filed a petition in Case 5-AC-40, seeking to amend the certification in Case 5-RC-11493 by deleting the name Foxhurley and by substituting the name Fox Hostler's, Inc. After an investigation, the Acting Regional Director for Region 5 amended the certification in accordance with the petition. The December 24, 1981, charge was served on Foxhurley, Inc. Thereafter, on January 8, 1982, the first amended charge was served on Fox Hostler's, Inc.

² Official notice is taken of the record in the representation proceeding, Case 5-RC-11493, as the term "record" is defined in Secs. 102.68 and 102.69(g) of the Board's Rules and Regulations, Series 8, as amended. See *LTV Electrosystems, Inc.*, 166 NLRB 938 (1967), enfd. 388 F.2d 683 (4th Cir. 1968); *Golden Age Beverage Co.*, 167 NLRB 151 (1967), enfd. 415 F.2d 26 (5th Cir. 1969); *Intertype Co. v. Penello*, 269 F.Supp. 573 (D.C.Va. 1967); *Follett Corp.*, 164 NLRB 378 (1967), enfd. 397 F.2d 91 (7th Cir. 1968); Sec. 9(d) of the NLRA, as amended.

to relitigate issues which were or could have been litigated in a prior representation proceeding.³

All issues raised by Respondent in this proceeding were or could have been litigated in the prior representation proceeding, and Respondent does not offer to adduce at a hearing any newly discovered or previously unavailable evidence, nor does it allege that any special circumstances exist herein which would require the Board to reexamine the decision made in the representation proceeding. We therefore find that Respondent has not raised any issue which is properly litigable in this unfair labor practice proceeding. Accordingly, we grant the Motion for Summary Judgment.

On the basis of the entire record, the Board makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. THE BUSINESS OF RESPONDENT

Respondent is a Virginia corporation engaged in the movement of truck trailers and the performance of maintenance and tire repairs at the Potomac yard in Alexandria, Virginia. In the course and conduct of its business, Respondent annually furnishes goods and services valued in excess of \$50,000 to customers located inside the Commonwealth of Virginia which customers in turn purchased goods and services valued in excess of \$50,000 from points located outside the Commonwealth of Virginia.

We find, on the basis of the foregoing, that Respondent is, and has been at all times material herein, an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act, and that it will effectuate the policies of the Act to assert jurisdiction herein.

II. THE LABOR ORGANIZATION INVOLVED

Brotherhood Railway Carmen of the United States and Canada, AFL-CIO, CLC, is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

III. THE UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

A. *The Representation Proceeding*

1. The unit

The following employees of Respondent constitute a unit appropriate for collective-bargaining purposes within the meaning of Section 9(b) of the Act:

All full-time and regular part-time employees including jockeys, mechanics, drivers, maintenance employees, tire repairmen, plant clerical employees and helpers employed by the Employer at its Alexandria, Virginia, location, but excluding all office clerical employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

2. The certification

On May 20, 1981, a majority of the employees of Respondent in said unit, in a secret-ballot election conducted under the supervision of the Regional Director for Region 5, designated the Union as their representative for the purpose of collective bargaining with Respondent.

The Union was certified as the collective-bargaining representative of the employees in said unit on October 22, 1981, and the Union continues to be such exclusive representative within the meaning of Section 9(a) of the Act.

B. *The Request To Bargain and Respondent's Refusal*

Commencing on or about December 8, 1981, and at all times thereafter, the Union has requested Respondent to bargain collectively with it as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of all the employees in the above-described unit. Commencing on or about December 18, 1981, and continuing at all times thereafter to date, Respondent has refused, and continues to refuse, to recognize and bargain with the Union as the exclusive representative for collective bargaining of all employees in said unit.

Accordingly, we find that Respondent has, since December 18, 1981, and at all times thereafter, refused to bargain collectively with the Union as the exclusive representative of the employees in the appropriate unit, and that, by such refusal, Respondent has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act.

IV. THE EFFECT OF THE UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES UPON COMMERCE

The activities of Respondent set forth in section III, above, occurring in connection with its operations described in section I, above, have a close, intimate, and substantial relationship to trade, traffic, and commerce among the several States and tend to lead to labor disputes burdening and obstructing commerce and the free flow of commerce.

³ See *Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. v. N.L.R.B.*, 313 U.S. 146, 162 (1941); Rules and Regulations of the Board, Secs. 102.67(f) and 102.69(c).

V. THE REMEDY

Having found that Respondent has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act, we shall order that it cease and desist therefrom, and, upon request, bargain collectively with the Union as the exclusive representative of all employees in the appropriate unit and, if an understanding is reached, embody such understanding in a signed agreement.

In order to insure that the employees in the appropriate unit will be accorded the services of their selected bargaining agent for the period provided by law, we shall construe the initial period of certification as beginning on the date Respondent commences to bargain in good faith with the Union as the recognized bargaining representative in the appropriate unit. See *Mar-Jac Poultry Company, Inc.*, 136 NLRB 785 (1962); *Commerce Company d/b/a Lamar Hotel*, 140 NLRB 226, 229 (1962), enfd. 328 F.2d 600 (5th Cir. 1964), cert. denied 379 U.S. 817; *Burnett Construction Company*, 149 NLRB 1419, 1421 (1964), enfd. 350 F.2d 57 (10th Cir. 1965).

The Board, upon the basis of the foregoing facts and the entire record, makes the following:

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Fox Hostler's, Inc., is an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

2. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of the United States and Canada, AFL-CIO, CLC, a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

3. All full-time and regular part-time employees including jockeys, mechanics, drivers, maintenance employees, tire repairmen, plant clerical employees and helpers employed by the Employer at its Alexandria, Virginia, location, but excluding all office clerical employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act, constitute a unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining within the meaning of Section 9(b) of the Act.

4. Since October 22, 1981, the above-named labor organization has been and now is the certified and exclusive representative of all employees in the aforesaid appropriate unit for the purpose of collective bargaining within the meaning of Section 9(a) of the Act.

5. By refusing on or about December 18, 1981, and at all times thereafter, to bargain collectively with the above-named labor organization as the exclusive bargaining representative of all the employees of Respondent in the appropriate unit, Respondent has engaged in and is engaging in unfair

labor practices within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) of the Act.

6. By the aforesaid refusal to bargain, Respondent has interfered with, restrained, and coerced, and is interfering with, restraining, and coercing, employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them in Section 7 of the Act, and thereby has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8(a)(1) of the Act.

7. The aforesaid unfair labor practices are unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

ORDER

Pursuant to Section 10(c) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, the National Labor Relations Board hereby orders that the Respondent, Fox Hostler's, Inc., Alexandria, Virginia, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall:

1. Cease and desist from:

(a) Refusing to bargain collectively concerning rates of pay, wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment with Brotherhood Railway Carmen of the United States and Canada, AFL-CIO, CLC, as the exclusive bargaining representative of its employees in the following appropriate unit:

All full-time and regular part-time employees including jockeys, mechanics, drivers, maintenance employees, tire repairmen, plant clerical employees and helpers employed by the Employer at its Alexandria, Virginia, location, but excluding all office clerical employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

(b) In any like or related manner interfering with, restraining, or coercing employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them in Section 7 of the Act.

2. Take the following affirmative action which the Board finds will effectuate the policies of the Act:

(a) Upon request, bargain with the above-named labor organization as the exclusive representative of all employees in the aforesaid appropriate unit with respect to rates of pay, wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment and, if an understanding is reached, embody such understanding in a signed agreement.

(b) Post at its Alexandria, Virginia, facility copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix."⁴

⁴ In the event that this Order is enforced by a Judgment of a United States Court of Appeals, the words in the notice reading "Posted by Order of the National Labor Relations Board" shall read "Posted Pursuant to a Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals Enforcing an Order of the National Labor Relations Board."

Copies of said notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 5, after being duly signed by Respondent's representative, shall be posted by Respondent immediately upon receipt thereof, and be maintained by it for 60 consecutive days thereafter, in conspicuous places, including all places where notices to employees are customarily posted. Reasonable steps shall be taken by Respondent to ensure that said notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material.

(c) Notify the Regional Director for Region 5, in writing, within 20 days from the date of this Order, what steps have been taken to comply herewith.

APPENDIX

NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES
POSTED BY ORDER OF THE
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
An Agency of the United States Government

WE WILL NOT refuse to bargain collectively concerning rates of pay, wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment with Brotherhood Railway Carmen of the United States and Canada, AFL-CIO, CLC,

as the exclusive representative of the employees in the bargaining unit described below.

WE WILL NOT in any like or related manner interfere with, restrain, or coerce our employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them by Section 7 of the Act.

WE WILL, upon request, bargain with the above-named Union, as the exclusive representative of all employees in the bargaining unit described below, with respect to rates of pay, wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment and, if an understanding is reached, embody such understanding in a signed agreement. The bargaining unit is:

All full-time and regular part-time employees including jockeys, mechanics, drivers, maintenance employees, tire repairmen, plant clerical employees and helpers employed by the Employer at its Alexandria, Virginia, location, but excluding all office clerical employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

FOX HOSTLER'S, INC.